arXiv:1507.01288v2 [math.AC] 5 Feb 2016

ON PSEUDO SYMMETRIC MONOMIAL CURVES

MESUT ŞAHİN AND NİL ŞAHİN

Abstract. We study monomial curves, toric ideals and monomial algebras associated to 4-generated pseudo symmetric numerical semigroups. Namely, we determine indispensable binomials of these toric ideals, give a characterization for these monomial algebras to have strongly indispensable minimal graded free resolutions. We also characterize when the tangent cones of these monomial curves at the origin are Cohen-Macaulay.

1. Introduction

Let $n_1, \ldots, n_4$ be positive integers with $\gcd(n_1, \ldots, n_4) = 1$. Then the numerical semigroup $S = \langle n_1, \ldots, n_4 \rangle$ is defined to be the set $\{u_1 n_1 + \cdots + u_4 n_4 \mid u_i \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Let K be a field and $K[S] = K[t^{n_1}, \ldots, t^{n_4}]$ be the semigroup ring of S, then $K[S] \simeq A/I_S$ where, $A = K[X_1, \ldots, X_4]$ and I_S is the kernel of the surjection $A \xrightarrow{\phi_0} K[S]$, where $X_i \mapsto t^{n_i}$.

Pseudo Frobenious numbers of S are defined to be the elements of the set $PF(S) = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} - S \mid n + s \in S \text{ for all } s \in S - \{0\}\}$. The largest pseudo Frobenious number not belonging to S is called the Frobenious number and is denoted by $g(S)$. S is called pseudo symmetric if $PF(S) = \{g(S)/2, g(S)\}$. By [24, Theorem 6.5, Theorem 6.4], the semigroup S is pseudo symmetric if and only if there are integers $\alpha_i > 1$, $1 \le i \le 4$, and $\alpha_{21} > 0$, with $\alpha_{21} < \alpha_1$, such that $n_1 = \alpha_2\alpha_3(\alpha_4 - 1) + 1$, $n_2 = \alpha_{21}\alpha_3\alpha_4 + (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1)(\alpha_3 - 1) + \alpha_3$, $n_3 = \alpha_1\alpha_4 + (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1)(\alpha_2 - 1)(\alpha_4 - 1) - \alpha_4 + 1$, $n_4 = \alpha_1\alpha_2(\alpha_3 - 1) + \alpha_{21}(\alpha_2 - 1) + \alpha_2$.

From now on, S is assumed to be a pseudo symmetric numerical semigroup. Then, by [24], $K[S] = A/(f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= X_1^{\alpha_1} - X_3 X_4^{\alpha_4 - 1}, \quad f_2 = X_2^{\alpha_2} - X_1^{\alpha_{21}} X_4, \quad f_3 = X_3^{\alpha_3} - X_1^{\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1} X_2, \\ f_4 &= X_4^{\alpha_4} - X_1 X_2^{\alpha_2 - 1} X_3^{\alpha_3 - 1}, \quad f_5 = X_3^{\alpha_3 - 1} X_1^{\alpha_{21} + 1} - X_2 X_4^{\alpha_4 - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Motivated originally from its applications in Algebraic Statistics many authors have studied the concept of indispensability, see e.g. [33] and [6, 15, 23] and later strong indispensability, see [7, 8, 5]. In section two, we determine indispensable binomials of I_S and prove that $K[S]$ has a strongly indispensable minimal S-graded free resolution if and only if $\alpha_4 > 2$ and $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} > 2$, see Theorem 2.5. In section three, we consider the affine curve C_S with parametrization

$$X_1 = t^{n_1},\ X_2 = t^{n_2},\ X_3 = t^{n_3},\ X_4 = t^{n_4}$$

corresponding to S. Recall that the local ring corresponding to the monomial curve C_S is $R_S = K[[t^{n_1}, \ldots, t^{n_4}]]$ and its Hilbert function is defined as the Hilbert

---

Date: February 8, 2016.

The authors were supported by the project 114F094 under the program 1001 of the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey.

function of its associated graded ring, $gr_m(K[[t^{n_1},\dots,t^{n_4}]])$, which is isomorphic to the ring $K[S]/I_{S*}$. Here, I_{S*} is the defining ideal of the tangent cone of C_S at the origin and is generated by the homogeneous summands f_* of the elements $f \in I_S$. We characterize when the tangent cone of C_S is Cohen-Macaulay in terms of the defining integers α_i and α_{21}. Cohen-Macaulayness of the tangent cone reveals how nice the singularity at the origin is and verifies Sally's conjecture that *the Hilbert function is non-decreasing for one dimensional Cohen-Macaulay local ring R.*

2. INDISPENSABILITY

In this section, we determine the indispensable binomials in I_S and characterize the conditions under which $K[S]$ has a strongly indispensable minimal S-graded free resolution. First, recall some notions from [6]. The S-degree of a monomial is defined to be $\deg_S(X_1^{u_1}X_2^{u_2}X_3^{u_3}X_4^{u_4}) = \sum_{i=1}^4 u_i n_i \in S$. Let $V(d)$ be the set of monomials of S-degree d. Denote by $G(d)$ the graph with vertices the elements of $V(d)$ and edges $\{m,n\} \subset V(d)$ such that the binomial $m-n$ is generated by binomials in I_S of S-degree strictly smaller than d. In particular, when $\gcd(m,n) \neq 1$, $\{m,n\}$ is an edge of $G(b)$. $d \in S$ is called a Betti S-degree if there is a minimal generator of I_S of S-degree d and β_d is the number of times d occurs as a Betti S-degree. Both the set B_S of Betti S-degrees and β_d is an invariant of I_S. S-degrees of binomials in I_S which are not comparable with respect to $<_S$ constitute a subset denoted M_S whose elements are called minimal binomial S-degrees, where $s_1 <_S s_2$ if $s_2 - s_1 \in S$. In general, $M_S \subseteq B_S$. By Komeda's result, $B_S = \{d_1,d_2,d_3,d_4,d_5\}$ if d_i's are all distinct, where d_i is the S-degree of f_i, for $i = 1,\dots,5$. A binomial is called indispensable if it appears in every minimal generating set of I_S. The following useful observation to detect indispensable binomials is not explicitly stated in [6].

Lemma 2.1. *A binomial of S-degree d is indispensable if and only if $\beta_d = 1$ and $d \in M_S$.*

Proof. A binomial of S-degree d is indispensable if and only if $G(d)$ has two connected components which are singletons, by [6, Corollary 2.10]. From the paragraph just after [6, Corollary 2.8], the condition that $G(d)$ has two connected components is equivalent to $\beta_d = 1$. Finally, [6, Proposition 2.4] completes the proof, since the connected components of $G(d)$ are singletons if and only if $d \in M_S$. □

We use the following many times in the sequel.

Lemma 2.2. *If $0 < v_k < \alpha_k$ and $0 < v_l < \alpha_l$, for $k \neq l \in \{1,2,3,4\}$, then $v_k n_k - v_l n_l \notin S$.*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that $v_k n_k - v_l n_l \in S$. Then

$$v_k n_k - v_l n_l = \sum_{i=1}^4 u_i n_i = u_1 n_1 + u_2 n_2 + u_3 n_3 + u_4 n_4$$

for some non-negative u_k's.

Hence, $(v_k - u_k)n_k = (v_l + u_l)n_l + u_s n_s + u_r n_r \in \langle n_l, n_s, n_r \rangle$. If $v_k - u_k < 0$ then $(v_k - u_k)n_k \in S \cap (-S)$ but this is a contradiction as $S \cap (-S) = \{0\}$. If $v_k - u_k = 0$, then $(v_l + u_l)n_l + u_s n_s + u_r n_r = 0$ and this is impossible as v_l is positive. That is, $v_k - u_k > 0$. This contradicts with the fact that α_i is the smallest positive number with this property as $0 < v_i - u_i \leq v_i < \alpha_i$. □

Now, we determine the minimal binomial S-degrees.

Proposition 2.3. $M_S = \{d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4, d_5\}$ if $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} > 2$ and $M_S = \{d_1, d_2, d_3, d_5\}$ if $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} = 2$.

Proof. Observe that
$d_1 - d_2 = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21})n_1 - n_4$
$d_1 - d_3 = (\alpha_{21} + 1)n_1 - n_2$
$d_1 - d_4 = n_3 - n_4$
$d_1 - d_5 = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1)n_1 - (\alpha_3 - 1)n_3$
$d_2 - d_3 = (\alpha_2 - 1)n_2 - (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1)n_1$
$d_2 - d_4 = n_3 - (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21})n_1$
$d_2 - d_5 = (\alpha_2 - 1)n_2 - (\alpha_4 - 1)n_4$
$d_3 - d_4 = n_3 - n_1 - (\alpha_2 - 1)n_2$
$d_3 - d_5 = n_3 - (\alpha_{21} + 1)n_1$
$d_4 - d_5 = (\alpha_2 - 1)n_2 - \alpha_{21}n_1$.
Then, $d_i - d_j = v_k n_k - u_l n_l$ for some $k \neq l \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ with $0 < v_k < \alpha_k$ and $0 < v_l < \alpha_l$ except for $d_3 - d_4$ and $d_4 - d_3$. Hence, we can say $d_i - d_j \notin S$ from Lemma 2.2 for all i, j except 3 and 4.

Assume $d_3 - d_4 \in S$. Then $n_3 - n_1 - (\alpha_2 - 1)n_2 = u_1n_1 + u_2n_2 + u_3n_3 + u_4n_4$ for some non-negative u_i's. So, $(1-u_3)n_3 = (1+u_1)n_1 + (\alpha_2 - 1 + u_2)n_2 + u_4n_4 > 0$. This contradicts to α_3 being the minimal number with the property $\alpha_3 n_3 \in \langle n_1, n_2, n_4\rangle$, as $0 < 1 - u_3 < \alpha_3$. Hence $d_3 - d_4$ can not be in S.

There are two possibilities for $d_4 - d_3$. If $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} = 2$, then we have $d_4 - d_3 = (\alpha_2 - 2)n_2 + (\alpha_3 - 1)n_3 - (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 2)n_1 = (\alpha_2 - 2)n_2 + (\alpha_3 - 1)n_3 \in S$.

If $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} > 2$, we show that $d_4 - d_3 \notin S$. Assume contrary that $d_4 - d_3 = n_1 + (\alpha_2 - 1)n_2 - n_3 = u_1n_1 + u_2n_2 + u_3n_3 + u_4n_4$. Then, $(\alpha_2 - 1 - u_2)n_2 = (u_1 - 1)n_1 + (u_3 + 1)n_3 + u_4n_4$. If $u_1 > 0$, then $0 < \alpha_2 - 1 - u_2 < \alpha_2$, since $u_3 + 1 > 0$. But this contradicts to the minimality of α_2. Hence $u_1 = 0$ and $n_1 + (\alpha_2 - 1 - u_2)n_2 = (u_3 + 1)n_3 + u_4n_4$ with $\alpha_2 - 1 - u_2 > 0$. (If $\alpha_2 - 1 - u_2 \leq 0$, then $n_1 = (u_2 + 1 - \alpha_2)n_2 + (u_3 + 1)n_3 + u_4n_4$ and this implies $n_1 \in \langle n_2, n_3, n_4\rangle$ which can not happen). Then if $u_4 = 0$, we have $(u_3 + 1)n_3 = n_1 + (\alpha_2 - 1 - u_2)n_2$. As $u_3 + 1 < \alpha_3$ gives a contradiction with the minimality of α_3, we assume $u_3 + 1 = \alpha \geq \alpha_3$. Then $\alpha_3n_3 + (\alpha - \alpha_3)n_3 = n_1 + (\alpha_2 - 1 - u_2)n_2 \Rightarrow (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1)n_1 + n_2 + (\alpha - \alpha_3)n_3 = n_1 + (\alpha_2 - 1 - u_2)n_2 \Rightarrow (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 2)n_1 + (\alpha - \alpha_3)n_3 = (\alpha_2 - 2 - u_2)n_2 \Rightarrow 0 < \alpha_2 - 2 - u_2 < \alpha_2$ and this gives a contradiction with the minimality of α_2. On the other hand, if $u_4 > 0$, then $n_1 + \alpha_2n_2 = (1 + u_2)n_2 + (u_3 + 1)n_3 + u_4n_4$, and as $\alpha_2n_2 = 1 + \alpha_{21}n_1 + n_4$, we have $(1 + \alpha_{21})n_1 = (1 + u_2)n_2 + (u_3 + 1)n_3 + (u_4 - 1)n_4$. As $0 < 1 + \alpha_{21} < \alpha_1$, this contradicts with the minimality of α_1. Hence, $d_4 - d_3$ can not be an element of S. □

As a consequence, we determine the indispensable binomials in I_S. Part of this result is remarked at the end of [23].

Corollary 2.4. Indispensable binomials of I_S are $\{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5\}$ if $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} > 2$ and are $\{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_5\}$ if $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} = 2$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 2.1 and Proposition 2.3, since $\beta_{d_i} = 1$, for all $i = 1, \ldots, 5$. □

We finish this section with its main result.

Theorem 2.5. *Let S be a 4-generated pseudo-symmetric semigroup. Then $K[S]$ has a strongly indispensable minimal graded free resolution if and only if $\alpha_4 > 2$ and $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} > 2$.*

Proof. According to Proposion 29 of [5] it is enough to check whether the differences between 1-Betti degrees $d_i - d_j$ and differences between 2-Betti degrees $b_i - b_j$ do not belong to S. Indeed, $d_i - d_j \notin S$ if and only if $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} > 2$ from the proof of Proposition 2.3. For the differences of 2-Betti degrees, observe first, since $d_i = \deg(f_i)$, we have
$d_1 = \alpha_1 n_1 = n_3 + (\alpha_4 - 1)n_4$
$d_2 = \alpha_2 n_2 = \alpha_{21} n_1 + n_4$
$d_3 = \alpha_3 n_3 = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1)n_1 + n_2$
$d_4 = \alpha_4 n_4 = n_1 + (\alpha_2 - 1)n_2 + (\alpha_3 - 1)n_3$
$d_5 = (\alpha_{21} + 1)n_1 + (\alpha_3 - 1)n_3 = n_2 + (\alpha_4 - 1)n_4$.
And from corollary 16 of [5],we have
$b_1 = d_1 + n_2 = d_3 + (\alpha_{21} + 1)n_1 = d_5 + n_3$
$b_2 = d_2 + d_3$
$b_3 = d_1 + (\alpha_3 - 1)n_3 = d_3 + (\alpha_4 - 1)n_4 = d_5 + (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1)n_1$
$b_4 = d_4 + n_2 = d_2 + n_1 + (\alpha_3 - 1)n_3 = d_5 + n_4$
$b_5 = d_1 + n_4 = d_2 + (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21})n_1 = d_3 + n_1 + (\alpha_2 - 1)n_2 = d_4 + n_3$
$b_6 = d_2 + (\alpha_4 - 1)n_4 = d_4 + \alpha_{21} n_1 = d_5 + (\alpha_2 - 1)n_2$
and
$c_1 = b_1 + n_4 = b_2 + n_1 = b_4 + n_3 = b_5 + n_2$

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 &= b_1 + (\alpha_2 - 1)n_2 + (\alpha_3 - 1)n_3 \\ &= b_2 + (\alpha_4 - 1)n_4 \\ &= b_3 + d_2 = b_3 + \alpha_2 n_2 \\ &= b_4 + (\alpha_1 - 1)n_1 \\ &= b_5 + \alpha_{21} n_1 + (\alpha_3 - 1)n_3 \\ &= b_6 + d_3 = b_6 + \alpha_3 n_3 \end{aligned}$$

As a result, from c_1, we get the differences $b_1 - b_2 = n_1 - n_4$, $b_1 - b_4 = n_3 - n_4$, $b_1 - b_5 = n_2 - n_4$, $b_2 - b_4 = n_3 - n_1$, $b_2 - b_5 = n_2 - n_1$, $b_4 - b_5 = n_2 - n_3$ and from c_2, we get the differences $b_1 - b_3 = n_2 - (\alpha_3 - 1)n_3$, $b_1 - b_6 = n_3 - (\alpha_2 - 1)n_2$, $b_4 - b_3 = n_4 - (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1)n_1$, $b_5 - b_3 = n_4 - (\alpha_3 - 1)n_3$, $b_4 - b_6 = n_2 - \alpha_{21} n_1$, $b_5 - b_6 = n_3 - \alpha_{21} n_1$, $b_3 - b_6 = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1)n_1 - (\alpha_2 - 1)n_2$. Furthermore, $b_2 - b_3 = \alpha_2 n_2 - (\alpha_4 - 1)n_4 = \alpha_{21} n_1 + (2 - \alpha_4)n_4$ and $b_2 - b_6 = n_2 + n_3 - (\alpha_{21} + 1)n_1$. Observe that $b_i - b_j = v_k n_k - v_l n_l$ for some $k \neq l \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ with $0 < v_k < \alpha_k$ and $0 < v_l < \alpha_l$. By Lemma 2.2, for any i and j, $b_i - b_j \notin S$ except from $b_2 - b_3$, $b_2 - b_6$ and $b_6 - b_2$. For $b_2 - b_3$, $b_2 - b_6$ and $b_6 - b_2$, check the following:

$b_2 - b_3 = \alpha_{21} n_1 + (2 - \alpha_4)n_4 = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{4} u_i n_i$

$\Rightarrow (\alpha_{21} - u_1)n_1 = u_2 n_2 + u_3 n_3 + (u_4 - 2 + \alpha_4) > 0$ if $\alpha_4 > 2$. Then $0 < \alpha_{21} - u_1 < \alpha_1$, a contradiction with the minimality of $\alpha_1 \Rightarrow b_2 - b_3 \notin S$. On the other hand, if $\alpha_4 = 2$, then $b_2 - b_3 = \alpha_{21} n_1 \in S$

$b_2 - b_6 = n_2 + n_3 - (\alpha_{21} + 1)n_1 = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{4} u_i n_i$

$\Rightarrow n_2 + n_3 = (\alpha_{21} + 1 + u_1)n_1 + \sum\limits_{i=2}^{4} u_i n_i > 0$. As $\alpha_{21} + 1 + u_1 > 0$, $u_2 = u_3 = 0$

$\Rightarrow n_2 + n_3 = (\alpha_{21} + 1 + u_1)n_1 + u_4 n_4$ and $u_4 > 0$ ($u_4 = 0$ implies $\alpha n_1 \in < n_2, n_3, n_4 >$ with $\alpha < \alpha_1$ because if $\alpha \geq \alpha_1$, then $n_2 + n_3 = \alpha_1 n_1 + (\alpha - \alpha_1)n_1 + u_4 n_4 =$

$n_3+n_4(\alpha_4-1)+(\alpha-\alpha_1)n_1+u_4n_4 \Rightarrow n_2 = n_4(\alpha_4+u_4-1)+(\alpha-\alpha_1)n_1 \in < n_1, n_4 >$ gives a contradiction.)
$\Rightarrow n_2+n_3 = \alpha_{21}n_1+(1+u_1)n_1+n_4+(u_4-1)n_4 = (1+u_1)n_1+\alpha_2n_2+(u_4-1)n_4$
$\Rightarrow n_3 = (u_1+1)n_1+(\alpha_2-1)n_2+(u_4-1)n_4 \in < n_2, n_3, n_4 >$, contradiction. Hence, $b_2 - b_6 \notin S$
$b_6 - b_2 = (\alpha_{21}+1)n_1 - n_2 - n_3 = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{4} u_in_i$
$\Rightarrow (\alpha_{21}+1-u_1)n_1 = (u_2+1)n_2+(u_3+1)n_3+u_4n_4 > 0$. Then $0 < \alpha_{21}+1-u_1 < \alpha_1$, a contradiction with the minimality of α_1. Hence, $b_6 - b_2$ can not be an element of S either.
As a result, $K[S]$ has a strongly indispensable minimal graded free resolution if and only if $\alpha_4 > 2$ and $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} > 2$. $\square$

3. Cohen-Macaulayness of the tangent cone

In this section, we consider the affine curve C_S with parametrization

$$X_1 = t^{n_1},\ X_2 = t^{n_2},\ X_3 = t^{n_3},\ X_4 = t^{n_4}$$

corresponding to the pseudo symmetric semigroup $S =< n_1, n_2, n_3, n_3 >$. Recall that the local ring corresponding to the monomial curve C_S is $R = K[[t^{n_1}, \dots, t^{n_4}]]$ and its Hilbert function $H_R(n)$ is defined as the Hilbert function of its associated graded ring, $gr_m(K[[t^{n_1}, \dots, t^{n_4}]])$, which is isomorphic to the ring $K[S]/I_{S*}$. Here, I_S is the defining ideal of C_S and I_{S*} is the ideal generated by the homogeneous summands f_* of the elements $f \in I_S$. I_{S*} is the defining ideal of the tangent cone of C_S at the origin. We will study the Cohen-Macaulayness of the ring $K[X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4]/I_{S*}$ since Cohen-Macaulayness simplifies the computation of the Hilbert function [30]. For some recent and past activity about the tangent cone of C_S, see [1, 2, 22, 31, 9, 32].

It is a conjecture due to Sally that *If R is a one dimensional Cohen-Macaulay local ring with small enough embeddding dimension, then $H_R(n)$ is non-decreasing.* This conjecture is obvious in embedding dimension one, proved in embedding dimensions two by Matlis [25] and three by Elias [13]. For embedding dimension 4, Gupta and Roberts gave counterexamples in [16], and for each embedding dimension greater than 4, Orecchia gave counterexamples in [28]. However, for semigroup rings, there are no counterexamples when the embedding dimension is smaller than 10; counterexamples are given for monomial curves in affine 10-space by Herzog and Waldi in [21] and in affine 12-space by Eakin and Sathaye in [12]. More recently, [11, 29, 10, 17] give sufficient conditions under which $H_R(n)$ is non-decreasing. And, most recently, [27] and [26] announced some methods for producing Gorenstein numerical semigroup rings whose tangent cones have decreasing Hilbert function.

We give characterizations under which the tangent cone is Cohen-Macaulay. This will show that Hilbert function of the associated graded ring of a monomial curve corresponding to a pseudo-symmetric semigroup is non-decreasing by [14].

Remark 3.1. Depending on the ordering among n_1, n_2, n_3 and n_4 there are 24 possible cases as can be seen from the examples in the next table. We will determine standard bases and characterize Cohen-Macaulayness completely in the first 12 cases. For the remaining 12 cases, finding a general form for the standard basis is not possible, so we give some partial results.

Table 1. cases

	α_{21}	α_1	α_2	α_3	α_4	n_1	n_2	n_3	n_4
$n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < n_4$	5	15	5	5	5	101	166	215	325
$n_1 < n_2 < n_4 < n_3$	5	15	5	5	10	226	291	465	325
$n_1 < n_3 < n_2 < n_4$	5	12	5	5	3	51	104	82	205
$n_1 < n_3 < n_4 < n_2$	5	12	5	7	11	351	428	362	385
$n_1 < n_4 < n_2 < n_3$	5	11	5	5	10	226	275	281	245
$n_1 < n_4 < n_3 < n_2$	5	12	5	6	11	301	366	362	325
$n_2 < n_1 < n_3 < n_4$	3	12	12	5	3	121	82	210	621
$n_2 < n_1 < n_4 < n_3$	2	10	5	5	7	151	103	232	213
$n_2 < n_3 < n_1 < n_4$	2	7	7	7	7	295	129	187	313
$n_2 < n_3 < n_4 < n_1$	2	7	5	6	9	241	134	183	188
$n_2 < n_4 < n_1 < n_3$	3	8	8	4	10	289	136	323	221
$n_2 < n_4 < n_3 < n_1$	3	7	5	4	8	141	109	133	122
$n_3 < n_1 < n_2 < n_4$	13	15	9	12	10	973	1583	213	1598
$n_3 < n_1 < n_4 < n_2$	13	15	9	12	14	1405	2207	301	1598
$n_3 < n_2 < n_1 < n_4$	2	4	7	5	4	106	49	31	131
$n_3 < n_2 < n_4 < n_1$	2	4	4	5	6	101	69	34	74
$n_3 < n_4 < n_1 < n_2$	5	8	5	5	10	226	263	143	185
$n_3 < n_4 < n_2 < n_1$	2	7	5	12	17	961	464	359	398
$n_4 < n_1 < n_2 < n_3$	3	10	3	4	21	241	274	430	99
$n_4 < n_1 < n_3 < n_2$	5	10	5	5	10	226	271	235	225
$n_4 < n_2 < n_1 < n_3$	7	10	10	2	13	241	186	334	173
$n_4 < n_2 < n_3 < n_1$	3	7	5	4	10	181	133	169	122
$n_4 < n_3 < n_1 < n_2$	3	10	3	8	11	241	314	220	219
$n_4 < n_3 < n_2 < n_1$	7	10	10	4	15	561	430	388	373

3.1. **Cohen-Macaulayness of the tangent cone when n_1 is the smallest.**

In this section, we assume that n_1 is the smallest in $\{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4\}$. Using the indispensable binomials of I_S, we characterize the Cohen-Macaulayness of the tangent cone of C_S. First, we get the necessary conditions.

Lemma 3.2. *If the tangent cone of the monomial curve C_S is Cohen-Macaulay, then the following must hold*

(1) $\alpha_2 \leq \alpha_{21} + 1$,
(2) $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_1$,
(3) $\alpha_4 \leq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$.

Proof. Corollary 2.4 implies that f_2 and f_3 are indispensable binomials of I_S, which means that they appear in every standard basis. To prove (1), assume contrary that $\alpha_2 > \alpha_{21} + 1$. Then, $\mathrm{LM}(f_2) = X_1^{\alpha_{21}} X_4$ is divisible by X_1. This leads to a contradiction as [4, Lemma 2.7] implies that the tangent cone is not Cohen-Macaulay. Similarly, when $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_3 > \alpha_1$, $\mathrm{LM}(f_3) = X_1^{\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1} X_2$ is divisible by X_1. So, if the tangent cone is Cohen-Macaulay, then (1) and (2) must hold.

To show the last inequality holds, assume not: $\alpha_4 > \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$. Then $\mathrm{LM}(f_4) = X_1 X_2^{\alpha_2 - 1} X_3^{\alpha_3 - 1}$ is divisible by X_1. If $\alpha_1 > \alpha_{21} + 2$, f_4 is indispensable by Corollary 2.4 again. As before, the tangent cone is not Cohen Macaulay, a contradiction.

So, we must have $\alpha_1 = \alpha_{21} + 2$. In this case, there exists a binomial g in a minimal standard basis of I_S such that $\mathrm{LM}(g) \mid \mathrm{LM}(f_4)$ and $X_1 \nmid \mathrm{LM}(g)$. Hence $\mathrm{LM}(g) = X_2^a X_3^b$ with $0 < a \leq \alpha_2 - 1$ and $0 < b \leq \alpha_3 - 1$ since the case $a = 0$ contradicts with the minimality of d_2 and the case $b = 0$ contradicts with the minimality of d_3. By Proposition 2.3 and its proof, $M_S = \{d_1, d_2, d_3, d_5\}$ are the minimal degrees and the only degree that is smaller than d_4 is d_3. Since $\deg(g) < d_4$, we must have $d_3 < \deg(g) < d_4$. Hence, $\deg(g) - d_3 = an_2 - (\alpha_3 - b)n_3 \in S$ with $0 < a < \alpha_2$ and $0 < \alpha_3 - b < \alpha_3$ but this contradicts to Lemma 2.2. So, (3) must hold as well. □

Before we check if the conditions (1), (2) and (3) are sufficient, we note the following.

Remark 3.3. $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_4$ holds. Indeed, as f_1 is S-homogeneous and $n_1 < n_4$, we have $(\alpha_4 - 1)n_4 < n_3 + (\alpha_4 - 1)n_4 = \alpha_1 n_1 < \alpha_1 n_4$ implying $\alpha_1 > \alpha_4 - 1$.

Next, we compute a standard basis for I_S, when (1), (2) and (3) hold.

Lemma 3.4. *If the conditions* (1), (2) *and* (3) *hold, the set* $G = \{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5\}$ *is a minimal standard basis for* I_S *with respect to a negative degree reverse lexicographical ordering making* X_1 *the smallest variable.*

Proof. We will apply standard basis algorithm to the set $G = \{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5\}$ with the normal form algorithm NFMora, see [19] for details. We need to show $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_i, f_j)|G) = 0$ for any $i \neq j$ with $1 \leq i, j \leq 5$. Observe that the conditions (1) and (3) imply that $\alpha_4 \leq \alpha_{21} + \alpha_3$(*) and hence,

- $\mathrm{LM}(f_1) = \mathrm{LM}(X_1^{\alpha_1} - X_3 X_4^{\alpha_4 - 1}) = X_3 X_4^{\alpha_4 - 1}$, by Remark 3.3
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_2) = \mathrm{LM}(X_2^{\alpha_2} - X_1^{\alpha_{21}} X_4) = X_2^{\alpha_2}$, by (1).
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_3) = \mathrm{LM}(X_3^{\alpha_3} - X_1^{\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1} X_2) = X_3^{\alpha_3}$, by (2)
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_4) = \mathrm{LM}(X_4^{\alpha_4} - X_1 X_2^{\alpha_2 - 1} X_3^{\alpha_3 - 1}) = X_4^{\alpha_4}$, by (3)
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_5) = \mathrm{LM}(X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1} X_3^{\alpha_3 - 1} - X_2 X_4^{\alpha_4 - 1}) = X_2 X_4^{\alpha_4 - 1}$, by (*).

Then we conclude the following:

- $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_i, f_j)|G) = 0$ as $\mathrm{LM}(f_i)$ and $\mathrm{LM}(f_j)$ are relatively prime, for $(i, j) \in \{(1, 2), (2, 3), (2, 4), (3, 4), (3, 5)\}$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_3) = X_1^{\alpha_1} X_3^{\alpha_3 - 1} - X_1^{\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1} X_2 X_4^{\alpha_4 - 1}$ and by (*) its leading monomial is $X_1^{\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1} X_2 X_4^{\alpha_4 - 1}$, which is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_5)$. As $\mathrm{ecart}(f_5) = \mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_3))$ and $\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_3)) = 0$, we have
$$NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_3)|G) = 0.$$
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_4) = X_1^{\alpha_1} X_4 - X_1 X_2^{\alpha_2 - 1} X_3^{\alpha_3}$.
$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_2 &\leq \alpha_{21} + 1 \text{ from (1). Then,} \\ \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 &\leq \alpha_3 + \alpha_{21} + 1 \text{ then as } \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} \text{ from (2)} \\ \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 &\leq \alpha_1 + 1. \end{aligned}$$
  As a result, $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_4)) = X_1 X_2^{\alpha_2 - 1} X_3^{\alpha_3}$. Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ divides $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_4))$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_4)) \geq \mathrm{ecart}(f_3)$. Then, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_4)) = X_1^{\alpha_1} X_4 - X_1^{\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21}} X_2^{\alpha_2}$. As $\alpha_2 \leq \alpha_{21} + 1$ from (1), $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} + \alpha_2 \leq \alpha_1 + 1$ and hence $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_4))) = X_1^{\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21}} X_2^{\alpha_2}$. Among the leading monomials of elements of G, only $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)$

divides this with $\operatorname{ecart}(f_2) = \alpha_{21} + 1 - \alpha_2 = \operatorname{ecart}(\operatorname{spoly}(f_3, \operatorname{spoly}(f_1, f_4))$. Then $\operatorname{spoly}(f_2, \operatorname{spoly}(f_3, \operatorname{spoly}(f_1, f_4))) = 0$ implying

$$NF(\operatorname{spoly}(f_1, f_4)|G) = 0.$$

- $\operatorname{spoly}(f_1, f_5) = X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1}X_3^{\alpha_3} - X_1^{\alpha_1}X_2$ with $\operatorname{LM}(\operatorname{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1}X_3^{\alpha_3}$ by (2). Only $\operatorname{LM}(f_3)$ divides this. As $\operatorname{ecart}(\operatorname{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = \alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} + \alpha_3 = \operatorname{ecart}(f_3)$ and $\operatorname{spoly}(f_3, \operatorname{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = 0$, $NF(\operatorname{spoly}(f_1, f_5)|G) = 0$.
- $\operatorname{spoly}(f_2, f_5) = X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1}X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1} - X_1^{\alpha_{21}}X_4^{\alpha_4}$. As (3) implies $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_4 \leq \alpha_{21} + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$, $\operatorname{LM}(\operatorname{spoly}(f_2, f_5)) = X_1^{\alpha_{21}}X_4^{\alpha_4}$. Only $\operatorname{LM}(f_4)$ divides this. As $\operatorname{ecart}(\operatorname{spoly}(f_2, f_5)) = \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1 - \alpha_4 = \operatorname{ecart}(f_4)$ and $\operatorname{spoly}(f_4, \operatorname{spoly}(f_2, f_5)) = 0$, $NF(\operatorname{spoly}(f_2, f_5)|G) = 0$. Finally,
- $\operatorname{spoly}(f_4, f_5) = X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}X_4 - X_1X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$. Then $\alpha_2 \leq \alpha_{21} + 1$ implies $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_{21} + 1 + \alpha_3$ and hence $\operatorname{LM}(\operatorname{spoly}(f_4, f_5)) = X_1X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$. Only $\operatorname{LM}(f_2)$ divides this. Since $\operatorname{ecart}(\operatorname{spoly}(f_4, f_5)) = \alpha_{21} + 1 - \alpha_2 = \operatorname{ecart}(f_2)$ and $\operatorname{spoly}(f_2, \operatorname{spoly}(f_4, f_5)) = 0$, $NF(\operatorname{spoly}(f_4, f_5)|G) = 0$.

It is not hard to see that this standard basis is minimal, so we are done. □

We are now ready to give the complete characterization of the Cohen-Macaulayness of the tangent cone.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose n_1 is the smallest. The tangent cone of C_S is Cohen-Macaulay if and only if*

1. $\alpha_2 \leq \alpha_{21} + 1$,
2. $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_1$,
3. $\alpha_4 \leq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$.

Proof. If the tangent cone of C_S is Cohen-Macaulay, then (1), (2) and (3) hold, by Lemma 3.2. If (1), (2) and (3) hold, then from Lemma 3.4, a minimal standard basis for I_S is $G = \{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5\}$ and $X_1 \nmid \operatorname{LM}(f_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$. Thus, it follows from [4, Lemma 2.7] that the tangent cone is Cohen-Macaulay. □

3.2. Cohen Macaulayness of the tangent cone when n_2 is the smallest.

In this section, we deal with the Cohen Macaulayness of the tangent cone when n_2 is the smallest in $\{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4\}$. As before, we get the necessary conditions first.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose n_2 is the smallest. If the tangent cone of the monomial curve C_S is Cohen-Macaulay, then the following must hold*

1. $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_1$,
2. $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_4$,
3. $\alpha_4 \leq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$,
4. $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_4 + \alpha_2 - 1$.

Proof. If tangent cone is Cohen-Macaulay then (1) and (2) comes from the indispensability of f_3 and f_5. If $\alpha_1 > \alpha_{21} + 2$, f_4 is indispensable, in which case (3) follows. If $\alpha_1 = \alpha_{21} + 2$, f_4 is not indispensable. To prove (3) in this case, assume contrary that $\alpha_4 > \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$. Then $\operatorname{LM}(f_4) = X_1X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$. As $f_4 \in I_S$, there exists a binomial g in a minimal standard basis of I_S such that $\operatorname{LM}(g) \mid \operatorname{LM}(f_4)$ and as the tangent cone is Cohen-Macaulay $X_2 \nmid \operatorname{LM}(g)$. Hence $\operatorname{LM}(g) = X_1^aX_3^b$ with $a \leq 1$ and $b \leq \alpha_3 - 1$. Then $\deg(f_5) - \deg(g) = (\alpha_{21} + 1 - a)n_1 + (\alpha_3 - 1 - b)n_3 \in S$ but this contradicts with the minimality of $\deg(f_5)$. Hence, (3) must hold.

For the last condition, the result follows immediately if $\alpha_4 \geq \alpha_1$, as in this case, $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_4 + \alpha_{21} \leq \alpha_4 + \alpha_2 - 1$. When $\alpha_4 < \alpha_1$, assume contrary that $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_1 > \alpha_4 + \alpha_2 - 1$. Then, as $(\alpha_1 + \alpha_{21})n_1 = \alpha_2 n_2 + n_3 + (\alpha_4 - 2)n_4$, the binomial $f_6 = X_1^{\alpha_1+\alpha_{21}} - X_2^{\alpha_2} X_3 X_4^{\alpha_4-2} \in I_S$ and $\mathrm{LM}(f_6) = X_2^{\alpha_2} X_3 X_4^{\alpha_4-2}$ is divisible by X_2. As the tangent cone is Cohen-Macaulay there exists a nonzero polynomial f in a minimal standard basis of I_S such that $\mathrm{LM}(f) \mid \mathrm{LM}(f_6)$ and $X_2 \nmid \mathrm{LM}(f)$. This implies that $\mathrm{LM}(f) = X_3^a X_4^b$, where $a \leq 1$ and $b \leq \alpha_4 - 2$, and that $\deg(f_1) - \deg(f) = (1-a)n_3 + (\alpha_4 - 1 - b)n_4$ is also in S which contradicts with the minimality of $\deg(f_1)$. Hence, (4) must hold. □

Before computing a standard basis, we observe the following.

Remark 3.7. When n_2 is the smallest, $\alpha_{21} + 1 \leq \alpha_2$ holds automatically. Indeed, as f_2 is S-homogeneous, $\alpha_{21}n_1 < \alpha_{21}n_1 + n_4 = \alpha_2 n_2 < \alpha_2 n_1$ implying $\alpha_{21} < \alpha_2$.

Now, we compute a standard basis under the conditions (1), (2), (3), and (4).

Lemma 3.8. *Let n_2 be the smallest in $\{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4\}$ and*

(1) $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_1$
(2) $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_4$
(3) $\alpha_4 \leq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$
(4) $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_4 + \alpha_2 - 1$

then a minimal standard basis for I_S is

(i) $\{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5\}$ *if* $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_4$,
(ii) $\{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5, f_6 = X_1^{\alpha_1+\alpha_{21}} - X_2^{\alpha_2} X_3 X_4^{\alpha_4-2}\}$ *if* $\alpha_1 > \alpha_4$,

with respect to negative degree reverse lexicographical ordering with $X_3, X_4 > X_1 > X_2$.

Proof. To prove (i), let $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_4$.

- $\mathrm{LM}(f_1) = \mathrm{LM}(X_1^{\alpha_1} - X_3 X_4^{\alpha_4-1}) = X_1^{\alpha_1}$, from assumption.
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_2) = \mathrm{LM}(X_2^{\alpha_2} - X_1^{\alpha_{21}} X_4) = X_1^{\alpha_{21}} X_4$, from remark 3.7.
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_3) = \mathrm{LM}(X_3^{\alpha_3} - X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}-1} X_2) = X_3^{\alpha_3}$, by (1)
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_4) = \mathrm{LM}(X_4^{\alpha_4} - X_1 X_2^{\alpha_2-1} X_3^{\alpha_3-1}) = X_4^{\alpha_4}$, by (3)
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_5) = \mathrm{LM}(X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1} X_3^{\alpha_3-1} - X_2 X_4^{\alpha_4-1}) = X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1} X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$, by (2).

Then we conclude the following:

- $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_i, f_j)|G) = 0$ as $\mathrm{LM}(f_i)$ and $\mathrm{LM}(f_j)$ are relatively prime, for $(i,j) \in \{(1,3), (2,3), (1,4), (3,4), (4,5)\}$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_2) = -X_3 X_4^{\alpha_4} + X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}} X_2^{\alpha_2}$ with $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_2)) = -X_3 X_4^{\alpha_4}$ by (1) and (3). Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_4)$ divides this and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_2)) \geq \mathrm{ecart}(f_4)$. So, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_2)) = -X_1 X_2^{\alpha_2-1} X_3^{\alpha_3} + X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}} X_2^{\alpha_2}$ whose leading monomial is $-X_1 X_2^{\alpha_2-1} X_3^{\alpha_3}$, by (2). Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ divides this but as
$$\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_2))) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_3) \quad \text{and}$$
$$\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_4, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_2))) = 0,$$
it follows that $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_2)|G) = 0$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5) = -X_3^{\alpha_3} X_4^{\alpha_4-1} + X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}-1} X_2 X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$ whose leading monomial is $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = -X_3^{\alpha_3} X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$ from (1). Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ divides this and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_3)$. Then $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = 0$. Hence $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)|G) = 0$.

- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,f_4)=-X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1}X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}+X_2^{\alpha_2}X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$ and $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,f_4))=-X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1}X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$ from (2). Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_5)$ divides $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,f_4))$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,f_4))=\mathrm{ecart}(f_5)$. Then $\mathrm{spoly}(f_5,\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,f_4))=0$. Hence $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,f_4)|G)=0$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,f_5)=-X_2X_4^{\alpha_4}+X_1X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$ and $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,f_5))=-X_2X_4^{\alpha_4}$ from (4). Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_4)$ divides $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,f_5))$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,f_5))=\mathrm{ecart}(f_4)$. Then $\mathrm{spoly}(f_4,\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,f_5))=0$. So, $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,f_5)|G)=0$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3,f_5)=-X_1^{\alpha_1}X_2+X_2X_3X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$ and $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3,f_5))=-X_1^{\alpha_1}X_2$ from the assumption $\alpha_1\le\alpha_4$. Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_1)$ divides $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3,f_5))$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3,f_5))=\mathrm{ecart}(f_1)$. Then $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,\mathrm{spoly}(f_3,f_5))=0$. Hence $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3,f_5)|G)=0$.

So, $G=\{f_1,f_2,f_3,f_4,f_5\}$ is a standard basis whose minimality can be seen easily. In order to prove (ii), assume now that $\alpha_4<\alpha_1$.

- $\mathrm{LM}(f_1)=\mathrm{LM}(X_1^{\alpha_1}-X_3X_4^{\alpha_4-1})=-X_3X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$, from assumption.
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)=\mathrm{LM}(X_2^{\alpha_2}-X_1^{\alpha_{21}}X_4)=X_1^{\alpha_{21}}X_4$, from Remark 3.7.
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)=\mathrm{LM}(X_3^{\alpha_3}-X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}-1}X_2)=X_3^{\alpha_3}$, by (1)
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_4)=\mathrm{LM}(X_4^{\alpha_4}-X_1X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1})=X_4^{\alpha_4}$, by (3)
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_5)=\mathrm{LM}(X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}-X_2X_4^{\alpha_4-1})=X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$, by (2).

Then we can conclude the following:

- $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,f_3)|G)=0$ as $\mathrm{LM}(f_1)$ and $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ relatively prime.
- $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3,f_4)|G)=0$ as $\mathrm{LM}(f_1)$ and $\mathrm{LM}(f_4)$ relatively prime.
- $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4,f_5)|G)=0$ as $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)$ and $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ relatively prime.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_2)=X_1^{\alpha_1+\alpha_{21}}-X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3X_4^{\alpha_4-2}$. If $\alpha_{21}+\alpha_1>\alpha_4+\alpha_2-1$, then $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_2))=-X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3X_4^{\alpha_4-2}$ and if $\alpha_{21}+\alpha_1\le\alpha_4+\alpha_2-1$, then $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_2))=X_1^{\alpha_1+\alpha_{21}}$ and in either way, none of the polynomials in G has leading monomial dividing these. Hence, G must include
$$f_6=X_1^{\alpha_1+\alpha_{21}}-X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3X_4^{\alpha_4-2}.$$
So, $G=\{f_1,f_2,f_3,f_4,f_5,f_6\}$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_3)=X_1^{\alpha_1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}-X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}-1}X_2X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$ and $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_3))=X_1^{\alpha_1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$ from (3). Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_5)$ divides this leading monomial and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_3))=\mathrm{ecart}(f_5)$. Then $\mathrm{spoly}(f_5,\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_3))=0$. Hence
$$NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_3)|G)=0.$$
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4)=X_1^{\alpha_1}X_4-X_1X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3}$.

  If $\alpha_1+1\le\alpha_2+\alpha_3$, then $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4))=X_1^{\alpha_1}X_4$. Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)$ divides $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4))$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4))\le\mathrm{ecart}(f_2)$. Therefore, we compute $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4))=-X_1X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3}+X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}}X_2^{\alpha_2}$ and $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4)))=-X_1X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3}$ from (1). Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ divides this leading monomial and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4)))=\mathrm{ecart}(f_2)$. As $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3,\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4)))=0$, $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4)|G)=0$.

  If $\alpha_1+1>\alpha_2+\alpha_3$, then $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4))=-X_1X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3}$. Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ divides $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4))$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4))\le\mathrm{ecart}(f_3)$. Also, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3,\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4))=X_1^{\alpha_1}X_4-X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}}X_2^{\alpha_2}$ and its leading monomial is $X_1^{\alpha_1}X_4$ from Remark 3.7. Among the polynomials in G, only $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)$ divides this and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3,\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4)))=\mathrm{ecart}(f_2)$. As $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2,\mathrm{spoly}(f_3,\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4)))=0$, we have $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1,f_4)|G)=0$ in this case also.

Observe that, up to here we have done the computations by using the assumption $\alpha_4 < \alpha_1$ only. For the rest of the computations, we also employ the condition (4).

- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5) = X_1^{\alpha_1+\alpha_{21}+1}X_3^{\alpha_3-2} - X_2X_4^{2\alpha_4-2}$.

  If $\alpha_1 + \alpha_{21} + \alpha_3 \leq 2\alpha_4 - 1$, then $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = X_1^{\alpha_1+\alpha_{21}+1}X_3^{\alpha_3-2}$. Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_6)$ divides $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5))$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) \leq \mathrm{ecart}(f_6)$. We have also $\mathrm{spoly}(f_6, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = X_1X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}X_4^{\alpha_4-2} - X_2X_4^{2\alpha_4-2}$ and $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_6, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5))) = -X_2X_4^{2\alpha_4-2}$ from (3). Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_4)$ divides this and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_6, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_4)$. As we have $\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, \mathrm{spoly}(f_6, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5))) = 0$, $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)|G) = 0$.

  If $2\alpha_4 - 1 < \alpha_1 + \alpha_{21} + \alpha_3$, then $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = -X_2X_4^{2\alpha_4-2}$. Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_4)$ divides $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5))$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) \leq \mathrm{ecart}(f_4)$ from the assumption $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_4 + \alpha_2 - 1$. $\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = X_1^{\alpha_1+\alpha_{21}+1}X_3^{\alpha_3-2} - X_1X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}X_4^{\alpha_4-2}$ and $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5))) = X_1^{\alpha_1+\alpha_{21}+1}X_3^{\alpha_3-2}$ again from the assumption $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_4 + \alpha_2 - 1$. Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_6)$ divides this and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_6)$. As $\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, \mathrm{spoly}(f_6, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5))) = 0$, we have $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)|G) = 0$ in this case also.
- $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_6)|G) = 0$ as the leading monomials are relatively prime.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_4) = -X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1}X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1} + X_2^{\alpha_2}X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$ and $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_4)) = -X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1}X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$ from (3). Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_5)$ divides this monomial and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_4)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_5)$. As $\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, \mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_4)) = 0$, we have $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_4)|G) = 0$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5) = -X_2X_4^{\alpha_4} + X_1X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$ and $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5)) = -X_2X_4^{\alpha_4}$ from (4). Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_4)$ divides this and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_4)$. As $\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, \mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5)) = 0$, we have $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5)|G) = 0$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_6) = -X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3X_4^{\alpha_4-1} + X_1^{\alpha_1}X_2^{\alpha_2}$ and its leading monomial is $-X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$ since $\alpha_4 < \alpha_1$ in this case. Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_1)$ divides this and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_6)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_1)$. As $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, \mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_6)) = 0$, we have

  $$NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_6)|G) = 0$$
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_5) = X_2X_3X_4^{\alpha_4-1} - X_1^{\alpha_1}X_2$ and $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_5)) = X_2X_3X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$ since $\alpha_4 < \alpha_1$ in this case. Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_1)$ divides this and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_5)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_1)$. As $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, \mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_5)) = 0$, we have

  $$NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_5)|G) = 0.$$
- $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_6)|G) = 0$ as $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ and $\mathrm{LM}(f_6)$ are relatively prime.
- $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, f_6)|G) = 0$ as $\mathrm{LM}(f_4)$ and $\mathrm{LM}(f_6)$ are relatively prime.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6) = -X_1^{\alpha_1-1}X_2X_4^{\alpha_4-1} + X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3^{\alpha_3}X_4^{\alpha_4-2}$.

  If $\alpha_1 + 1 \leq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3$, then $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)) = -X_1^{\alpha_1-1}X_2X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$. Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)$ divides $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6))$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)) \leq \mathrm{ecart}(f_2)$ from (1). $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)) = X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3^{\alpha_3}X_4^{\alpha_4-2} - X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}-1}X_2^{\alpha_2+1}X_4^{\alpha_4-2}$. $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6))) = X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3^{\alpha_3}X_4^{\alpha_4-2}$ from (1) again. Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ divides this monomial and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6))) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_3)$. As $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6))) = 0$, we have $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)|G) = 0$.

  If $\alpha_1 + 1 > \alpha_2 + \alpha_3$, then $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)) = X_2^{\alpha_2}X_3^{\alpha_3}X_4^{\alpha_4-2}$. Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ divides this and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)) \leq \mathrm{ecart}(f_3)$ from Remark 3.7. $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)) = X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}-1}X_2^{\alpha_2+1}X_4^{\alpha_4-2} - X_1^{\alpha_1-1}X_2X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$ and $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6))) = -X_1^{\alpha_1-1}X_2X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$ from Remark 3.7 again.

Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)$ divides this and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6))) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_2)$. As $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6))) = 0$, we have $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)|G) = 0$ in this case also.

Therefore, $G = \{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5, f_6\}$ is a standard basis whose minimality can be verified easily. □

We are now ready to give the full characterization.

Theorem 3.9. *Suppose n_2 is the smallest. Tangent cone of the monomial curve C_S is Cohen-Macaulay if and only if*

1. $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_1$,
2. $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_4$,
3. $\alpha_4 \leq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$,
4. $\alpha_{21} + \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_4 + \alpha_2 - 1$.

Proof. If tangent cone is Cohen-Macaulay then (1), (2), (3) and (4) must hold by Lemma 3.6. If (1), (2), (3) and (4) hold, then a minimal standard basis with respect to the negative degree reverse lexicographic ordering making X_2 the smallest variable is $G = \{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5\}$ in the case $\alpha_4 \geq \alpha_1$ and $G = \{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5, f_6\}$ in the case $\alpha_4 < \alpha_1$ from Lemma 3.8. X_2 does not divide $\mathrm{LM}(f_i)$ in both cases, so the tangent cone is Cohen-Macaulay by [4, Lemma 2.7]. □

3.3. Cohen Macaulayness of the tangent cone when n_3 is the smallest.

In this section, we deal with the Cohen Macaulayness of the tangent cone when n_3 is the smallest in $\{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4\}$. As before, we get the necessary conditions first.

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose n_3 is the smallest. If the tangent cone of the monomial curve C_S is Cohen-Macaulay, then the following must hold*

1. $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_4$,
2. $\alpha_4 \leq \alpha_{21} + \alpha_3$,
3. $\alpha_4 \leq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$ *if* $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} > 2$; $\alpha_4 \leq \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 - 3$ *if* $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} = 2$,

Proof. If tangent cone is Cohen-Macaulay then (1) and (2) comes from the indispensability of f_1 and f_5. If $\alpha_1 > \alpha_{21} + 2$, f_4 is indispensable, in which case (3) follows. If $\alpha_1 = \alpha_{21} + 2$, f_4 is not indispensable. To prove (3) in this case, assume contrary that $\alpha_4 > \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 - 3$. Then $\alpha_4 > \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$ and $\mathrm{LM}(f_4) = X_1 X_2^{\alpha_2 - 1} X_3^{\alpha_3 - 1}$. As $\mathrm{LM}(f_3) = X_1 X_2 \mid \mathrm{LM}(f_4)$, f_4 can not be in a minimal standard basis of I_S. It can not be in a minimal generating set since a minimal generating set would lie in a minimal standard basis. Since Betti S-degrees are invariant, there must be a binomial of degree d_4 in a minimal generating set. We prove that $f_4' = X_4^{\alpha_4} - X_2^{\alpha_2 - 2} X_3^{2\alpha_3 - 1}$ must belong to a minimal generating set and so to a minimal standard basis. This will follow from [6] and the claim that

$$\deg_S^{-1}(d_4) = \{X_4^{\alpha_4}\} \cup \{X_1 X_2^{\alpha_2 - 1} X_3^{\alpha_3 - 1}, X_2^{\alpha_2 - 2} X_3^{2\alpha_3 - 1}\}.$$

In order to prove the claim above, take $m \in \deg_S^{-1}(d_4)$. Since d_3 is the only S-degree smaller than d_4 and $\deg_S^{-1}(d_3) = \{X_3^{\alpha_3}, X_1 X_2\}$, it follows that $X_3^{\alpha_3} \mid m$ or $X_1 X_2 \mid m$ if $\deg_S(m) = d_4$. If $X_3^{\alpha_3} \mid m$, then $m = X_3^{\alpha_3} m'$. If $m' \neq X_2^{\alpha_2 - 2} X_3^{\alpha_3 - 1}$, then $m' - X_2^{\alpha_2 - 2} X_3^{\alpha_3 - 1} \in I_S$, as this binomial is S-homogeneous of S-degree $d = d_4 - d_3$. As d_3 is the only S-degree smaller than d_4, it follows that $d_3 <_S d <_S d_4$. So, $2d_3 <_S d_4$. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.2, we have

$$d_4 - 2d_3 = n_1 + (\alpha_2 - 1)n_2 + (\alpha_3 - 1)n_3 - n_1 - n_2 - \alpha_3 n_3 = (\alpha_2 - 2)n_2 - n_3 \notin S.$$

Thus, $m' = X_2^{\alpha_2-2}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$ and so $m = X_2^{\alpha_2-2}X_3^{2\alpha_3-1}$. By the same argument, if $X_1X_2 \mid m$ then $m = X_1X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$, hence the claim follows.

If $\alpha_4 > \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 - 3$, $\mathrm{LM}(f_4') = X_2^{\alpha_2-2}X_3^{2\alpha_3-1}$ is divisible by X_3, contradicting to the Cohen-Macaulayness of the tangent cone. So, (3) follows. □

Before computing a standard basis, we observe the following.

Remark 3.11. When n_3 is the smallest, $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} < \alpha_3$ holds automatically. Indeed, as f_3 is S-homogeneous, $(\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21})n_3 < (\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} - 1)n_1 + n_2 = \alpha_3 n_3$.

Now, we compute a standard basis.

Lemma 3.12. *Let n_3 be the smallest in $\{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4\}$ and*

(1) $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_4$,
(2) $\alpha_4 \leq \alpha_{21} + \alpha_3$,
(3) $\alpha_2 \leq \alpha_{21} + 1$,

then a minimal standard basis for I_S is

(i) $\{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5, f_6 = X_1^{\alpha_1-1}X_4 - X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3}\}$ *if* $\alpha_4 \leq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$,
(ii) $\{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4', f_5, f_6\}$ *when* $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} = 2$ *and* $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1 < \alpha_4 \leq \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 - 3$,

with respect to negative degree reverse lexicographical ordering with $X_2 > X_1, X_4 > X_3$.

Proof. To prove (i), let $\alpha_4 \leq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$.

- $\mathrm{LM}(f_1) = \mathrm{LM}(X_1^{\alpha_1} - X_3X_4^{\alpha_4-1}) = X_1^{\alpha_1}$, by (1),
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_2) = \mathrm{LM}(X_2^{\alpha_2} - X_1^{\alpha_{21}}X_4) = X_2^{\alpha_2}$, by (3),
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_3) = \mathrm{LM}(X_3^{\alpha_3} - X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}-1}X_2) = X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}-1}X_2$, from remark 3.11,
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_4) = \mathrm{LM}(X_4^{\alpha_4} - X_1X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}) = X_4^{\alpha_4}$, from assumption,
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_5) = \mathrm{LM}(X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1} - X_2X_4^{\alpha_4-1}) = X_2X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$, by (2).

Then we conclude the following:

- $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_i, f_j)|G) = 0$ as $\mathrm{LM}(f_i)$ and $\mathrm{LM}(f_j)$ are relatively prime, for $(i, j) \in \{(1, 2), (1, 4), (1, 5), (2, 4), (3, 4)\}$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_3) = X_3f_5$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_5)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_3)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_5)$. Thus, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_3)) = 0$ so that $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_3)|G) = 0$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_3) = X_1^{\alpha_1-1}X_4 - X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3}$ whose leading monomial $X_1^{\alpha_1-1}X_4$ is not divisible by leading monomials of binomials in G. Hence, G must include $f_6 = X_1^{\alpha_1-1}X_4 - X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3}$ and so, $G = \{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5, f_6\}$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5) = -X_1^{\alpha_{21}}f_4$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_4)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_4)$. Thus, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, \mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5)) = 0$ so that $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5)|G) = 0$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_5) = X_3^{\alpha_3-1}f_1$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_1)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_5)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_1)$. Thus, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, \mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_5)) = 0$ so that $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_5)|G) = 0$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, f_5) = -X_1X_3^{\alpha_3-1}f_2$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, f_5)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_2)$. Thus, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_4, f_5)) = 0$ so that $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, f_5)|G) = 0$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_6) = -X_3f_4$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_4)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_6)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_4)$. Thus, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_6)) = 0$ so that $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_6)|G) = 0$.

- $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_6)|G) = 0$ as $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)$ and $\mathrm{LM}(f_6)$ are relatively prime.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_6) = X_3^{\alpha_3} f_2$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_6)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_2)$. Thus, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_6)) = 0$ so that $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_6)|G) = 0$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, f_6) = -X_2^{\alpha_2-1} X_3^{\alpha_3-1} f_1$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_1)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, f_6)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_1)$. Thus,
$$\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, \mathrm{spoly}(f_4, f_6)) = 0 \text{ so that } NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, f_6)|G) = 0.$$
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6) = X_3^{\alpha_3-1}(X_2^{\alpha_2} X_3 X_4^{\alpha_4-2} - X_1^{\alpha_{21}+\alpha_1})$.

  If $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)) = X_2^{\alpha_2} X_3^{\alpha_3} X_4^{\alpha_4-2}$, then this is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)) \le \mathrm{ecart}(f_2)$. So, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)) = X_1^{\alpha_{21}} X_3^{\alpha_3-1} f_1$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_1)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6))) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_1)$. Thus,
$$\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, \mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6))) = 0 \text{ so that } NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)|G) = 0.$$
  If $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)) = X_1^{\alpha_{21}+\alpha_1} X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$, then this is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_1)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)) \le \mathrm{ecart}(f_1)$. So, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, \mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)) = X_3^{\alpha_3} X_4^{\alpha_4-2} f_2$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, \mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6))) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_2)$. Thus,
$$\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, \mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6))) = 0 \text{ so that } NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, f_6)|G) = 0.$$

Therefore, $G = \{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5, f_6\}$ is a standard basis whose minimality can be verified easily.

To prove (ii), let $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} = 2$ and $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1 < \alpha_4 \le \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 - 3$.

- $\mathrm{LM}(f_4') = \mathrm{LM}(X_4^{\alpha_4} - X_2^{\alpha_2-2} X_3^{2\alpha_3-1}) = X_4^{\alpha_4}$, from assumption,

Since $\mathrm{LM}(f_4') = \mathrm{LM}(f_4)$, some of the arguments above are valid for this case also. We check the rest below.

- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5) = -X_1^{\alpha_{21}} f_4$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5)) \le \mathrm{ecart}(f_3)$. So, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5)) = X_1^{\alpha_{21}} f_4'$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5))) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_4')$. Hence, we have
$$\mathrm{spoly}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5)), f_4') = 0 \text{ so } NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_5)|G) = 0.$$
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_4', f_5) = X_3^{\alpha_3-1} f_6$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_6)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4', f_5)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_6)$. Thus, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_6, \mathrm{spoly}(f_4', f_5)) = 0$ so that $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4', f_5)|G) = 0$.

  When $\mathrm{LM}(f_6) = X_1^{\alpha_1-1} X_4$, we only need to check the following:
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_6) = -X_3 f_4$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_6)) \le \mathrm{ecart}(f_3)$. So, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_6)) = X_3 f_4'$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_6))) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_4')$. Hence, we have
$$\mathrm{spoly}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_6)), f_4') = 0 \text{ so } NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_6)|G) = 0.$$
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_4', f_6) = -X_2^{\alpha_2-2} X_3^{\alpha_3} f_5$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_5)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4', f_6)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_5)$. So, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, \mathrm{spoly}(f_4', f_6)) = 0$ and $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4', f_6)|G) = 0$.

  When $\mathrm{LM}(f_6) = X_2^{\alpha_2-1} X_3^{\alpha_3}$, we only need to check the following:
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_6) = -X_1^{\alpha_{21}} X_4 f_3$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_6)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_3)$. So, $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_6)) = 0$ and $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_6)|G) = 0$.

- spoly$(f_3, f_6) = X_1^{\alpha_1}X_4 - X_2^{\alpha_2-2}X_3^{2\alpha_3}$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by LM(f_1) and ecart(spoly$(f_3, f_6)) \geq$ ecart(f_1). So, spoly$(f_1$, spoly$(f_3, f_6)) = -X_3f_4'$ and ecart(spoly$(f_1$, spoly$(f_3, f_6)))$ = ecart(f_4'). Hence, we have
  $$\text{spoly}(\text{spoly}(f_1, \text{spoly}(f_3, f_6)), f_4') = 0 \text{ so } NF(\text{spoly}(f_3, f_6)|G) = 0.$$
- spoly$(f_5, f_6) = X_1^{\alpha_1-1}f_4'$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by LM(f_4') and ecart(spoly$(f_5, f_6))$ = ecart(f_4'). So, spoly$(f_4'$, spoly$(f_5, f_6)) = 0$ and $NF(\text{spoly}(f_5, f_6)|G) = 0$.

Therefore, $G = \{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4', f_5, f_6\}$ is a standard basis whose minimality can be verified easily. □

We are now ready to give a list of sufficient conditions.

Corollary 3.13. If n_3 is the smallest and

(1) $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_4$,
(2) $\alpha_4 \leq \alpha_{21} + \alpha_3$,
(3) $\alpha_2 \leq \alpha_{21} + 1$,
(4) $\alpha_4 \leq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$,

hold, then the tangent cone of the monomial curve C_S is Cohen-Macaulay. If (1), (2), (3) hold, $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} = 2$ and $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1 < \alpha_4 \leq \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 - 3$, the tangent cone of C_S is Cohen-Macaulay if and only if $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$.

Proof. If (1), (2), (3) and (4) hold, then a minimal standard basis with respect to the negative degree reverse lexicographic ordering making X_3 the smallest variable is $G = \{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5, f_6\}$ from Lemma 3.12. X_3 does not divide LM(f_i), so the tangent cone is Cohen-Macaulay by [4, Lemma 2.7]. If (1), (2), (3) hold, $\alpha_1 - \alpha_{21} = 2$ and $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1 < \alpha_4 \leq \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 - 3$, then a minimal standard basis with respect to the negative degree reverse lexicographic ordering making X_3 the smallest variable is $G = \{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4', f_5, f_6\}$ from Lemma 3.12. X_3 does not divide LM(f_i), for $i = 1, \ldots, 5$, so the tangent cone is Cohen-Macaulay by [4, Lemma 2.7] if and only if X_3 does not divide LM(f_6) if and only if $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - 1$. □

We finish this section by illustrating that $\alpha_2 \leq \alpha_{21}+1$ is not a necessary condition for the Cohen-Macaulayness of the tangent cone.

Example 3.14. Let $\alpha_{21} = 2$, $\alpha_1 = 4$, $\alpha_2 = 5$, $\alpha_3 = 4$ and $\alpha_4 = 5$. Then $n_1 = 81$, $n_2 = 59$, $n_3 = 28$ and $n_4 = 74$. Observe that n_3 is the smallest and the conditions (1), (2) and (i) are satisfied but (3) is not. A minimal standard basis for I_S in this case can be computed as $\{X_1X_2 - X_3^5, X_1^2X_4 - X_2^4, X_1^4 - X_3X_4^4, X_2^5 - X_1X_3^5X_4, X_2X_4^4 - X_1^3X_3^4, X_4^5 - X_1X_2^3X_3^4\}$ with SINGULAR and as a result the tangent cone I_{S^*} is generated by
$G_* = \{X_1X_2, X_1^2X_4, X_1^4, X_2^5, X_2X_4^4, X_4^5\}$. As X_3 does not divide elements in this list, the tangent cone is still Cohen-Macaulay from [4, Lemma 2.7].

3.4. Cohen-Macaulayness of the tangent cone when n_4 is the smallest.

We get some necessary conditions first as before.

Lemma 3.15. *Suppose n_4 is the smallest in $\{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4\}$. If the tangent cone of the monomial curve C_S is Cohen-Macaulay then*

(1) $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_4$,
(2) $\alpha_2 \leq \alpha_{21} + 1$,
(3) $\alpha_3 + \alpha_{21} \leq \alpha_4$.

Proof. The results follow immediately from the indispensabilities of f_1, f_2 and f_5 respectively. ☐

Remark 3.16. If n_4 is the smallest in $\{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4\}$ then $\alpha_4 > \alpha_2+\alpha_3-1$. Indeed, as f_4 is S-homogeneous and n_4 is the smallest $\alpha_4 n_4 = n_1+(\alpha_2-1)n_2+(\alpha_3-1)n_3 > (\alpha_2+\alpha_3-1)n_4$ implying $\alpha_4 > \alpha_2+\alpha_3-1$.

Lemma 3.17. *Let n_4 be the smallest in $\{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4\}$ and the conditions*

1. $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_4$,
2. $\alpha_2 \leq \alpha_{21}+1$,
3. $\alpha_3+\alpha_{21} \leq \alpha_4$,
4. $\alpha_3 \leq \alpha_1-\alpha_{21}$,

hold, then $\{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5\}$ is a minimal standard basis for I_S with respect to negative degree reverse lexiographical ordering with $X_3 > X_1, X_2 > X_4$.

Proof. Observe that

- $\mathrm{LM}(f_1) = \mathrm{LM}(X_1^{\alpha_1} - X_3X_4^{\alpha_4-1}) = X_1^{\alpha_1}$, by (1)
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_2) = \mathrm{LM}(X_2^{\alpha_2} - X_1^{\alpha_{21}}X_4) = X_2^{\alpha_2}$, by (2)
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_3) = \mathrm{LM}(X_3^{\alpha_3} - X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}-1}X_2) = X_3^{\alpha_3}$, by (4)
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_4) = \mathrm{LM}(X_4^{\alpha_4} - X_1X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}) = X_1X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$, by remark 3.16
- $\mathrm{LM}(f_5) = \mathrm{LM}(X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1} - X_2X_4^{\alpha_4-1}) = X_1^{\alpha_{21}+1}X_3^{\alpha_3-1}$, by (3).

Then we can conclude the following:

- $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_i, f_j)|G) = 0$ as $\mathrm{LM}(f_i)$ and $\mathrm{LM}(f_j)$ relatively prime, for $(i, j) \in \{(1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 3), (2, 5)\}$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_4) = -X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3}X_4^{\alpha_4-1} + X_1^{\alpha_1-1}X_4^{\alpha_4}$ and $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_4)) = -X_2^{\alpha_2-1}X_3^{\alpha_3}X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$ by remark 3.16. Only $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ divides this and we have $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_4)) \leq \mathrm{ecart}(f_3)$. The leading monomial of the polynomial $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_4)) = -X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}-1}X_4^{\alpha_4-1}f_2$ is divisibly only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_4))) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_2)$. Thus,

  $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_4))) = 0$ and $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_4)|G) = 0$.

- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5) = -X_3^{\alpha_3}X_4^{\alpha_4-1}+X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}-1}X_2X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$ and $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = -X_3^{\alpha_3}X_4^{\alpha_4-1}$ by (4). $\mathrm{LM}(f_3)$ divides this and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_3)$. As $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, \mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)) = 0$, we have $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, f_5)|G) = 0$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_4) = -X_4f_5$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_5)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_4)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_5)$. As $\mathrm{spoly}(f_5, \mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_4)) = 0$, we have $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, f_4)|G) = 0$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_4) = -X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}}X_2^{\alpha_2}+X_3X_4^{\alpha_4}$ and $\mathrm{LM}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_4)) = -X_1^{\alpha_1-\alpha_{21}}X_2^{\alpha_2}$ by (1) and (2). $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)$ divides this and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_4)) \geq \mathrm{ecart}(f_2)$. $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_4)) = X_4f_1$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_1)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_4))) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_1)$. Thus,

  $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, \mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_4))) = 0$ and $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_4)|G) = 0$.

- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_5) = -X_2f_1$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_1)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_5)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_1)$. As $\mathrm{spoly}(f_1, \mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_5)) = 0$, we have $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_3, f_5)|G) = 0$.
- $\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, f_5) = -X_4^{\alpha_4-1}f_2$ whose leading monomial is divisible only by $\mathrm{LM}(f_2)$ and $\mathrm{ecart}(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, f_5)) = \mathrm{ecart}(f_2)$. As $\mathrm{spoly}(f_2, \mathrm{spoly}(f_4, f_5)) = 0$, we have $NF(\mathrm{spoly}(f_4, f_5)|G) = 0$.

So, G is a standard basis whose minimality is easy to check. □

Corollary 3.18. If the conditions (1), (2), (3) and (4) hold, then the tangent cone of C_S is Cohen-Macaulay.

Proof. If the conditions (1), (2), (3) and (4) hold, then $\{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5\}$ is a minimal standard basis for I_S with respect to negative degree reverse lexiographical ordering with X_4 the smallest variable from Lemma 3.17 and $X_4 \nmid \mathrm{LM}(f_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$. Thus, it follows from [4, Lemma 2.7] that the tangent cone is Cohen-Macaulay. □

Hence (1), (2), (3) and (4) are sufficient conditions for Cohen-Macaulayness but (4) is not a necessary condition. Indeed, tangent cone may be Cohen-Macaulay in the case $\alpha_3 > \alpha_1 - \alpha_{21}$ also.

Example 3.19. Let $\alpha_{21} = 4$, $\alpha_1 = 7$, $\alpha_2 = 3$, $\alpha_3 = 4$ and $\alpha_4 = 9$. Then $n_1 = 97$, $n_2 = 154$, $n_3 = 87$ and $n_4 = 74$. Observe that n_4 is the smallest and the conditions (1), (2) and (3) are satisfied but (4) is not. A minimal standard basis for I_S in this case can be computed as $\{X_1^2X_2 - X_3^4, X_2^3 - X_1^4X_4, X_1X_2^2X_3^3 - X_4^9, X_2^2X_3^4 - X_1^6X_4, X_1^7 - X_3X_4^8, X_1^5X_3^3 - X_2X_4^8, X_2X_3^7 - X_1X_4^9, X_1^3X_3^7 - X_2^2X_4^8, X_3^{11} - X_1^3X_4^9\}$ with SINGULAR and as a result the tangent cone I_{S^*} is generated by $G_* = \{X_1^2X_2, X_2^3, X_1X_2^2X_3^3, X_2^2X_3^4, X_1^7, X_1^5X_3^3, X_2X_3^7, X_1^3X_3^7 - X_2^2X_4^8, X_3^{11}\}$. As X_4 does not divide elements in this list, the tangent cone is Cohen-Macaulay from [4, Lemma 2.7].

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank F. Arslan and A. Katsampekis for very helpful suggestions. Most of the examples are computed by using the computer algebra systems Macaulay 2 and Singular, see [18, 20].

References

[1] F. Arslan, *Cohen-Macaulayness of tangent cones*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 128 (2000), 2243-2251.

[2] F. Arslan, A. Katsabekis, M. Nalbandiyan, *On the Cohen-Macaulayness of tangent cones of monomial curves in $\mathbb{A}^4(K)$*, arXiv:1512.04204.

[3] F. Arslan and P. Mete, *Hilbert functions of Gorenstein monomial curves*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 135 (2007), 1993-2002.

[4] F. Arslan, P. Mete and M. Şahin, *Gluing and Hilbert functions of monomial curves*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 137 (2009), 2225-2232.

[5] V. Barucci, R. Fröberg and M. Şahin, *On free resolutions of some semigroup rings*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 218(2014), no. 6,1107-1116.

[6] H. Charalambous, A. Katsabekis and A. Thoma, *Minimal systems of binomial generators and the indispensable complex of a toric Ideal*, Proc. of Amer. Math. Soc., 135(2007), 3443-3451.

[7] H. Charalambous, A. Thoma, *On simple A-multigraded minimal resolutions*, Contemporary Mathematics **502** (2009), 33–44.

[8] H. Charalambous, A. Thoma, *On the generalized Scarf complex of lattice ideals*, J. Algebra **323** (2010), 1197–1211.

[9] T. Cortadellas, S. Zarzuela, *Apery and micro-invariants of a one-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay local ring and invariants of its tangent cone*. J. Algebra 328 (2011), 94–113.

[10] T. Cortadellas, R. Jafari, S. Zarzuela, *On the Apry sets of monomial curves*, Semigroup Forum 86 (2013), no. 2, 289–320.

[11] M. D'Anna, M. Di Marca, V. Micale, *On the Hilbert function of the tangent cone of a monomial curve*. Semigroup Forum 91 (2015), no. 3, 718-730.

[12] J. Eakin, A. Sathaye, *Prestable ideals*, Journal of Algebra 41, (1976), 439-454.

[13] J. Elias, *The Conjecture of Sally on the Hilbert Function for Curve Singularities*, Journal of Algebra 160 No.1 (1993), 42-49.

[14] A. Garcia, *Cohen-Macaulayness of the associated graded ring of a semigroup ring*. Commun.Algebra 10 (1982), 393–415.

[15] P. A. Garcia-Sanchez and I. Ojeda, *Uniquely presented finitely generated commutative monoids*, Pacific J. Math. 248 (2010), 91-105.

[16] S. K. Gupta, L. G. Roberts,*Cartesian squares and ordinary singularities of curves*, Comm. in Algebra 11 No.2 (1983), 127-182.

[17] R. Jafari, S. Zarzuela, *On monomial curves obtained by gluing*, Semigroup Forum 88 (2014), no. 2, 397-416.

[18] D. Grayson, M. Stillman, Macaulay 2–A System for Computation in Algebraic Geometry and Commutative Algebra. http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2.

[19] G-M Greuel, G. Pfister, *A Singular Introduction to Commutative Algebra*, Springer-Verlag, 2002.

[20] G.-M. Greuel, G. Pfister, and H. Schönemann. SINGULAR 2.0. A Computer Algebra System for Polynomial Computations. Centre for Computer Algebra, University of Kaiserslautern (2001). `http://www.singular.uni-kl.de`.

[21] J. Herzog, R. Waldi, *A note on the Hilbert function of a one-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay ring*, Manuscripta Math. 16, (1975), 251-260.

[22] J. Herzog, D. I. Stamate, *On the defining equations of the tangent cone of a numerical semigroup ring*. J. Algebra 418 (2014), 8-28.

[23] A. Katsabekis, I. Ojeda, *An indispensable classification of monomial curves in* $\mathbb{A}^4$, Pac. J. Math. **268** (2014), 95–116.

[24] J. Komeda, *On the existence of Weierstrass points with a certain semigroup*, Tsukuba J. Math. 6 (1982), no. 2, 237-270.

[25] E. Matlis, *One-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay Rings*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 327, Springer-Verlag, 1977.

[26] A. Oneto, F. Strazzanti, G. Tamone, *One-dimensional Gorenstein local rings with decreasing Hilbert function*, (2016), arXiv:1602.00334.

[27] A. Oneto, G. Tamone, *On semigroup rings with decreasing Hilbert function*, (2016), arXiv:1602.00327.

[28] O. Orecchia, *One-dimensional local rings with reduced associated graded ring and their Hilbert functions*, Manuscripta Math., 32 (1980) 391-405.

[29] D. P. Patil, G.Tamone, *CM defect and Hilbert functions of monomial curves*, J.PureAppl.Algebra 215(2011), 1539?1551.

[30] J. Sally, *Good embedding dimensions for Gorenstein Singularities*, Math. Ann. 249 (1980), 95-106.

[31] Shen, Yi-Huang, *Tangent cone of numerical semigroup rings of embedding dimension three*. Comm. Algebra 39 (2011), no. 5, 1922?1940.

[32] T. Shibuta, *Cohen-Macaulayness of almost complete intersection tangent cones*, J. Algebra 319 (2008), 3222-3243.

[33] A. Takemura and S. Aoki, *Some characterizations of minimal Markov basis for sampling from discrete conditional distributions*, Ann. Inst. Statist. Math. 56:1 (2004), 1-17.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY, ANKARA, 06800 TURKEY
E-mail address: `mesut.sahin@hacettepe.edu.tr`

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING, BILKENT UNIVERSITY, ANKARA, 06800 TURKEY
E-mail address: `nilsahin@bilkent.edu.tr`